Clarifications No. 3, December 27, 2011 – San Diego I-805 HOV/BRT Design-Build Project Contract No. 11-2T2004

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
33	3	Book 2	General; Section 1.3.3; Page 1-2 and RID	The RFP documents specify ultimate widening north of Carroll Canyon for the pavement in the NB direction at the Sorrento Valley Rd off-ramp, which is a two-lane off-ramp. However, Layout Sheet L-14 in the RID Documents show the limits of paving to remain	The information on Layouts is correct for Stage 1.
34	4	ITP	Table 2-1, Procurement Schedule	Will the Department consider extending the Request for Clarifications Submittal Deadline to December 16, 2011?	Department extended the Request for Clarifications Submittal Deadline to December 14th 2011.
35	3	ITP Addendum 1	Table 2-1; Procurement Schedule	Will the Department consider changing the Price Proposal Due Date from January 20, 2012 to February 3, 2012?	The Department has considered the request presented by the Proposer and decided to not modify the schedule at this time.
36	3	Book 2 and RID	1.3.1; Pg 1-1	Section 1.3.1 states, " The Basic Configuration means those portions of the Preliminary Design Drawings that depict: . . " Please clarify which files under conceptual plans are Preliminary Design Drawings"	The Preliminary Design Drawings is referring to the Conceptual Plans in the RID.

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
37	3	Book 2 Clarifications No. 2 Addendum 3	Sections 1.3.1 Basic Configuration & 11.3.1 Design Requirements RFC No. 23 Section 15.2.1 Standards; and, b2T200aa1_update_112811.dgn	Response to RFC #23, data provided in updated design file (cross section A-A, Stage 1), and revisions included in Addendum 3 collectively indicate a uniform DAR cross section width of 41.6 feet between retaining wall layout lines with 12 foot lanes and 4 foot shoulders. Please provide documentation authorizing approval of revision to typical sections included in January 2011 Project Report (Attachment 13) and associated design approvals for elements/locations not addressed in the August 2009 Fact Sheets (Project Report, Attachment 15). 1) HDM 302.1 for continuous shoulder width, 2) HDM 309.1 for lateral clearance related to horizontal stopping sight distance requirements (NB HOV lane and Type 742 barrier), 3) HDM 309.1(3) (a) for horizontal clearance to safety shape barrier and crash attenuators, 4) HDM 309.1(3) (b) for horizontal clearance to walls, and 5) HDM 504.3(1) (c) for ramp shoulder width.	Cross section A-A, stage 1 shows - ES to ES is 40', 4'outside shoulder, 12' lane and 8'median. It should be 4' outside shoulder 11' lane, 4' inside shoulder and 2' concrete median barrier. Documentation authorizing approval of revision to typical will not be provided. Refer to Book 2, Section 11.3 for Design Requirements and Design Exceptions obtained for the Stage 1 project. Department has obtained some, but not all required design exceptions for the Project. Design-Builder will be responsible for obtaining other required design exceptions.
38	2	Book 2	Section 4.4.1.2	Is it the Department's intent that the work described in Book 2, Section 4.4.1.2 be included in the bid price for the contract? If so, how should the bidder ascertain the proper quantities and risk associated with such work if there is no way to know the scope of work at bid time?	Yes, The Design-Builder is responsible as indicated in Section 4.4.1.2 as amended by Addendum No. 4. Reports have been provided for information that is available.
39	3	Book 2	Section 4.4.1.2, Pg. 4-7 and Pg. 4-8	Text references quantities and unit prices for asbestos and lead containing materials generated from demolition as included in Table 1 (pg. 4-7) and Table 2 (pg. 4-8). Please provide Table 1 and / or Table 2 as referenced in the text.	Addendum No. 2 removed this language.

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
40	3	Book 2	Section 4.4.1.2, Pg. 4-9	Text refers bidders to Phase I and Phase II ESAs for review pertaining to soil and groundwater contaminated materials. Please provide the Phase I and Phase II ESA reports.	Addendum No. 4 modified this text to refer instead to the "Initial Site Assessment report, Aerial Deposited Lead, and Asbestos reports."
41	3	Book 2 Addendum 3	Exhibit 4-B4 – Section 401 Water Quality Certification"	The certification provides BMP and treated area requirements for the ultimate condition. We would like clarification as to the specific number and types of BMPs required within Phase I; as well as the total required treated impervious area (new and existing) within this phase.	The Stormwater Data Report for the ultimate project is provided in the RIDs. Per Book 2 Section 22 "Stormwater", the Design-Builder shall perform all work necessary to meet the stormwater requirements for the Project. Design-Builder will prepare the Stormwater Data Report for the Project defined in the RFP and will develop BMPs necessary for the Project.
42	3	Book 2	Exhibit 4-B4 "Section 401 Water Quality Certification" Section IV Additional Conditions: Post-construction Best Management Practices - Page 8	A. Post-construction BMPs must be implemented as described in the September 12, 2011 letter (Attachment 7) from the California Department of Transportation to the San Diego Water Board Executive Officer. Question – Is the Design Builder responsible for the implementation and costs associated with the content contained within the September 12, 2011 Letter referenced as Attachment 7? If so, please provide a copy of the September 12, 2011 letter referenced above as attachment 7.	Yes. The Design-Builder is responsible for this Section A as well as B D-F and H. See Exhibit 4-B5 "Design-Builder Responsibility for Permits" provided with Addendum Exhibit 4-B5 Department will provide the referenced September 12, 2011 letter.
43	3	Book 2	Exhibit 4-B4 "Section 401 Water Quality Certification" Section IV Additional Conditions: Post-construction Best Management Practices - Page 8	G. Department must inspect and maintain post-construction structural BMPs per the manufacturers' specifications and/or engineering design specifications. An inspection and maintenance log must be maintained for review by germane agencies. Copies of the inspection and maintenance log must be provided to the San Diego Water Board upon request. **Question:** Is the Design Builder responsible for the inspection and maintenance of Post-Construction BMP's? If so, when specifically does the maintenance period end?	No. The Design-Builder is not responsible for Section G after construction. See Exhibit 4-B5 "Design-Builder Responsibility for Permits" provided with Addendum Exhibit 4-B5

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
44	3	Book 2	Exhibit 4-B3 "1602 Department of Fish and Game Permit" Section 1 Administrative Measures – 1.4, Page 3 of 12	Designated biologist – Is the Design Builder responsible for the execution and costs associated with Section 1.14 – Designated Biologist?	Yes. The Design-Builder is responsible for this requirement. See Exhibit 4-B5 "Design-Builder Responsibility for Permits" provided with Addendum Exhibit 4-B5
45	3	Book 2	Exhibit 4-B4 "Section 401 Water Quality Certification" Section VI Monitoring Requirements Page 13	The California Department of Transportation must conduct bioassessment monitoring, as described in this section, to assess effects on the biological integrity of the Rose Creek impact area and Deer Canyon mitigation site. Bioassessment shall include: 1) the collection and reporting of specified in stream biological data, and 2) the collection and reporting of specified in stream physical and habitat data. The results of the Bioassessment must be submitted each year with the Mitigation Monitoring Reports. **Question** – Is the Design Builder Responsible for the execution and costs associated with Section A. Bioassessment?	Yes. The Design-Builder is responsible for this requirement (execution and cost) at Rose Creek but not at Deer Canyon. See Exhibit 4-B5 "Design-Builder Responsibility for Permits" provided with Addendum No. 4.

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
46	3	Book 2	Exhibit 4-B4 "Section 401 Water Quality Certification" Section VI Monitoring Requirements Page 16	The California Department of Transportation must conduct a quantitative, function-based assessment of the health of wetland and riparian habitats in the Rose Creek impact area and the Deer Canyon mitigation site using the California Rapid Assessment Method (CRAM)1 upstream, within, and downstream of Rose Creek impact and Deer Canyon mitigation sites. Monitoring must occur prior to impacts and for at least three consecutive years after impacts. The results of the CRAM assessment must be submitted each year with the Mitigation Monitoring Reports. **Question –** Is the Design Builder Responsible for the execution and costs associated with Section B. California Rapid Assessment Method?	Yes. The Design-Builder is responsible for this requirement (execution and cost) at Rose Creek but not at Deer Canyon. See Exhibit 4-B5 "Design-Builder Responsibility for Permits" provided with Addendum No. 4.
47	3	Book 2	Exhibit 4-B4 "Section 401 Water Quality Certification" Section VIII Monitoring Requirements Page 18	A. The California Department of Transportation must submit annual progress reports describing status of compliance with all requirements of this Certification to the San Diego Water Board prior to August 1 of each year following the issuance of this Certification until the project has reached completion. The California Department of Transportation must submit a Final Project Annual Report to the San Diego Water Board prior to August 1 following completion of the project **Question:** Is the Design Builder responsible for the execution and costs associated with the reporting requirements stated in Section VIII (A) above?	Yes. The Design-Builder is responsible for this section by providing this information to the Department. The Department will submit to the San Diego Water Board. See Exhibit 4-B5 "Design-Builder Responsibility for Permits" provided with Addendum Exhibit 4-B5.

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
48	3	Book 2	Exhibit 4-B4 "Section 401 Water Quality Certification" Section v Additional Conditions: Impacts and Compensa-tory Mitigation - Page 11	V. ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS: IMPACTS and COMPENSATORY MITIGATION **Section I** The California Department of Transportation must salvage leaf litter, coarse woody debris, and upper soil horizons from impacted jurisdictional water sites that are relatively free of invasive exotic species for use in on-site mitigation areas. **Section J** The California Department of Transportation must also salvage large cuttings from appropriate tree species if they exist at the impact site and use them as pole plantings at the mitigation site and/or the onsite restored areas **Question -** Is the Design Builder Responsible for the execution and costs associated with Sections I and J?	Yes. The Design-Builder is responsible for these Sections H – J. See Exhibit 4-B5 "Design-Builder Responsibility for Permits" provided with Addendum Exhibit 4-B5
49	3	Book 1	Section 6.2.1.1.1, Pg. 19	Reasonable accuracy is defined with respect to two differing quality levels; A and B. Please clarify which utilities are classified as Quality Level A and which utilities are classified as Quality Level B.	Updated Exhibit 6-C Existing Relocation Information has been provided with Addendum No. 4.
50	3	Book 2	Exhibit 6-A	In the MUAs provided in Exhibit 6-A, the responsibility for cost of utility relocations is divided between the Department and the Utility Owner. Is the design-builder responsible for the anticipated Department portion of costs of relocations or will a change order be granted to include this work into the contract?	The Department is responsible for the Department portion of costs. Refer to Book 2 Section 6 for the Design-Builder responsibilities for utilities. Book 2 Section 6.2.3.3 references Cost Estimates.

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
51	3	Book 2	Section 8.3.3.3 Geotechnical In-situ Test, Instrumentation and Geophysical Exploration	We would like clarification as to what document or standard will be used when determining the number of instrumentation points for monitoring, frequency of reading both during and post construction, and how long post wall construction will monitoring continue.	Recommendations from the Design Builder's Geotechnical Engineer, and the Caltrans Standard Special Provisions. Final readings shall be recorded at Completion of construction of wall, prior to substantial completion, and Final Acceptance.
52	3	Book 2	Section 8.3.5, Geotechnical Analysis and Design; and Section 13.3.2 Design Specifications	The next to last sentence of Section 8.3.5 states that "The Design-Builder shall also provide design recommendations, including remedial measures." Section 13.3.1 states that "The Design-Builder shall ensure that existing structures to be widened shall be seismically evaluated and retrofitted ….". Is the intent of the Department that should remedial measures be required for the foundations supporting Carroll Canyon Overhead Bridge (Bridge No. 57-787 R/L), as a result of potential liquefaction, that this work be included as part of the seismic retrofit of the bridge and that it will be performed as part of this contract? • Alternatively, since it has been identified in the contract documents that the soils at the Carroll Canyon Bridge (Bridge No. 57-787 R/L) have a high potential for liquefaction and lateral spreading; have the existing bridge foundations been analyzed and/or retrofitted for this condition? If so, we request a copy of the analysis and backup data be made available to us.	Yes. The intent of the Department is for the Design-Builder to perform a seismic study on the combined bridge structure, seismic studies for both the existing bridge and widened bridge, and retrofit the existing bridge structure if required based on the seismic study. In 1998, the existing structures at Carroll Canyon were retrofitted or upgraded to meet the standards at the time of retrofit. It is Department policy that the existing structures must be upgraded or retrofitted to conform to current standards anytime structural improvements or modification is made to the structure. All available information regarding the existing structures have been provided in the RID.
53	3	Book 2	Section 8.3.5, Geotechnical Analysis and Design	As liquefaction and lateral spreading forces are directly influenced by the groundwater level when performing the analysis and no consistent groundwater data is provided, can Department provide guidance as to the groundwater level for determining the potential and limits of liquefaction and/or lateral spreading within Carroll Canyon?	The groundwater elevations perched within the canyon bottom alluvium will vary greatly from surface flow to depth, in response to locally intense or seasonally prolonged rainfall or drought conditions, runoff of the local and upstream areas, along with surface flow conditions in the adjacent Carroll Canyon Creek. Please refer to the various foundation reports provided in the RIDs, and county records to determine a reasonable consistent groundwater level.

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
54	3	Book 2, RID	11.3.1, Concept Plans	**Clear Recovery Zones** Section 11.3.1 indicates that "*The Design Builder shall identify and correct all clear recovery zone deficiencies on the freeway facility for all areas adjacent to new construction*." This was further clarified on December 1, 2011 that all areas directly affected by construction and north of La Jolla Village are to be corrected. HDM section 309.1(2) states that "*A clear recovery zone is an unobstructed, relatively flat (4:1 or flatter) or gently sloping area beyond the edge of travelled way…*" While not specifically stated, the HDM is concerned with fill slopes (foreslopes) when describing clear recovery zones. The concept plans, ALT5 design file, and Typical Cross Sections X-2 all indicate that 2:1 cut slopes (backslopes) will be present within the 30' clear recovery zone without protection. We assume that 2:1 cut slopes meet the intent of the CRZ and are considered acceptable within the limits of this project.	Yes, the intent is that the 2:1 cut slopes meet the CRZ and are considered acceptable within the limits of this project, however, all side slopes steeper than 4:1 require Department approval per Book 2, Section 11.3.1.1.
55	2	Book 2	11.3.1 Pg. 11-2	The third bullet of the section states that the roadways are to be designed and constructed to "meet all future improvements identified as the "preferred alternative" in the environmental document. Project defined as Stage 1 of the 805 North Managed Lanes project with additional project features included in the General Description of Project." Is the intent of the Department to include all the associated improvements listed in the MND/FONSI document such at the Nobel Dr. DAR, the SR-52/I-805 direct connector ramp, and the park and ride / transit station at the southwest quadrant of Nobel Dr. and I-805 in this contract?	No, Book 2 Section 1.3 is the Project Description for the Project which defines the project features. The intent of the Project is to design and build the Ultimate project features as described in Section 1.3 and to accommodate the Ultimate project for the remaining areas within the Project limits.

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
56	2	Book 2	11.3.1 Pg. 11-3	Do the statements "the Design Builder shall design and construct all roadway elements according to the Department Standards. This includes but is not limited to horizontal alignment, vertical alignment, superelevation, cross slope, lane widths, shoulder widths, medians, clear recovery zone, side slopes, and cut and fill slopes." require the Design Builder to provide additional widenings from those shown in the Preliminary Engineering Documents if the existing pavement widths are not adequate to provide the design standards?	The intent is that the design should meet the standards except where non-standard features are part of the basic configuration (i.e. lane and shoulder widths). The Department has identified some, but not all of the design exceptions required for the Project. Design-Builder will be responsible for preparing any remaining design exceptions required for the Project.
57	3	Book 2	Section 12	Does the scope of work include final cleaning and repair of deficiencies of existing drainage systems that new systems tie into? Also, is the design-builder required to provide a complete drainage system with a renewed expected design life per the HDM as part of the project?	The Design-Builder will not be required to clean or repair deficiencies in existing systems unless directly related to construction activities. Proposed systems will be held to the HDM service life requirements.
58	4	Book 2	Section 13.4.1, second sentence of last paragraph	"…lateral displacement and rotation of retaining walls shall be based on the wall and site-specific requirements determined by the geotechnical engineer." Does this refer to the design-builder's geotechnical engineer?	Yes. This refers to the Design-Builder's Geotechnical Engineer.
59	3	Book 2	Section 13.5.4.1, Pg. 15 of Addendum 3	Addendum 3 included new CADD files which further define the project for the Carroll Canyon Bridge and DAR areas. These CADD files show a widening of Carroll Canyon Bridge that is less than that described on Page 15 of Addendum 3. Please revise the text on Page 15 so that the dimensions of the widening of the Carroll Canyon Bridge match the CADD file provided. Otherwise, please clarify the intended amount of widening which will be required for this contract.	The text has been revised to state that the structures "shall be widened for the ultimate lane configuration."

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
60	3	Book 2	16.3.1.2; Pg 16-6	The 11th bullet states that the "Design-Builder shall replace any existing signs within the project area that do not meet retroreflectivity requirements as defined in the CA MUTCD." Please provide the field survey data of retroreflectivity of all signs.	See Exhibit 16A "Existing Signs for Replacement" provided with Addendum No. 4.
61	3	Book 2	16.3.1.5.1	Please clarify the meaning of "physically impacted" in the first sentence of Section 16.3.1.5.1.	Overhead sign structures "physically impacted" refers to all overhead signs located in the median or in outside widening areas within the project limits that do not meet current standards.
62	3	Book 2	17.3.6; Pg 17-5	Section 17.3.6.1 requires; The Design Builder shall link the controllers of the vehicle detection stations/count stations . . .to the communication network." Please confirm that the Department essentially requires a new fiber network for the entire corridor	Addendum No. 4 has clarified the requirements for fiber optic work.
63	3	Book 2	21.2.3; Pg 21-2	DB is to verify all information prior to use: Exhibit 21-a states the design is based on laterally supported JPCP. Lateral support may require wider shoulders than defined in Basic Configuration. Please clarify which requirement governs.	Outside lane lateral support will not be needed since this is a stage project with future outside widening.
64	3	Book 2	Exhibit 21A	Confirm that the lateral support assumption is valid as shown in Exhibit 21 A even though isolation joints may be needed as was the case in adjacent projects.	Outside lane lateral support will not be needed since this is a stage project with future outside widening.
65	3	Book 2	Exhibit 21-A	What structural section shall be used for the outside pavement at the NB La Jolla Village Drive on-ramp and NB Mira Mesa Blvd off-ramp (Approx Sta 1417+60 to 1423+00 and 1435+00 to 1437+00)? No ramp section is specified per Exhibit 21-A in Book 2.	Use the structural section for the NB on-ramp from Mira Mesa Blvd for all on and off ramps.
66	3	General		Will the existing lighting that is not being disturbed with this project be required to be updated to current standards?	No.

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
67	3	General		Addendum 3 had the requirements that new Overhead Sign Structures meet the requirements of the ultimate project. Does this requirement hold where additional grading or retaining walls would be required	Yes, additional grading of slopes may be required.
68	3	General		Please confirm that the Design-Builder is to use the 2006 Standard Plans and Specifications	Confirmed.
69	3	RID	b2T200AA1_update_112811.dgn; and Clarification 2 Question #2; RFC 23	Does the proposed Carroll Canyon DAR section consist of two 12-foot lanes with 4-foot outside shoulders, 3-foot inside shoulders, and a 2-foot median barrier for a total width of 40 feet?	Cross section A-A, stage 1 shows - ES to ES is 40 feet, 4-foot outside shoulders, 12-foot lanes and 8-foot median. It should be 4-foot outside shoulders, 11-foot lanes, 4-foot inside shoulders and 2-foot concrete median barrier.
70	3	RID	Carroll Canyon Foundation Report dated 4-13-09	In the foundation report under Liquefaction Potential, a separate document entitled Seismic Design Recommendations is referenced which provides the liquefaction potential, extent, and any associated design loading from lateral spreading for the Carroll Canyon Road Bridge currently under construction. We request a copy for reference and our use in determining the potential and impacts from liquefaction on the new structures included in this contract.	A copy of the Seismic Design Recommendations for Carroll Canyon Road Bridge has been provided in the RID
71	3	RID	Conceptual Plans	In the southbound direction just north of Carroll Canyon, RW1453 includes an abrupt transition approaching the bridge per *b2T200aa1_update_112811.dgn* in the "hidden link," is this just a general wall location and can you provide line work for the proposed SB Sorrento Valley on-ramp?	This on-ramp is shown in alt5_update_112811.dgn. Final design will determine the length and location of the wall. Per Section 13.4, the Design-Builder shall determine the location(s) and types of retaining walls needed on the Project.
72	3	RID	Conceptual Plans	In the northbound direction for the Vista Sorrento on-ramp, which file governs for the roadway alignment, *alt5.dgn* or *b2T200aa1_update_112811.dgn (alt5_update_112811.dgn* shows no ramp line work)?	This on-ramp is shown in alt5_update_112811.dgn

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
73	3	RID	Conceptual Plans (Add 3)	In the northbound direction just north of Carroll Canyon, RW1452 has been shortened to new wall limits from approximately Sta 1452+15 to 1454+38 per *alt5_update_112811.dgn* in the "hidden link," can you confirm the change in wall limits?	Yes, the wall RW1452 has been shortened. Final design will determine the exact length of the wall. Per Section 13.4, the Design-Builder shall determine the location(s) and types of retaining walls needed on the Project.
74	3	RID	Conceptual Plans (Add 3)	In the northbound direction just south of Carroll Canyon, RW1441 has been deleted from the plans per *b2T200aa1_update_112811.dgn* in the "hidden link," can you confirm the deletion of this ultimate condition wall for the partial widening?	Wall RW1441 has been deleted. Final design will determine the length of the abutment wall and wing wall at this corner to keep the slope from impacting the Mira Mesa Blvd off-ramp. Per Section 13.4, the Design-Builder shall determine the location(s) and types of retaining walls needed on the Project.
75	3	RID	Conceptual Plans (Add 3)	In the northbound direction, at the north end of the project, RW1478 has been deleted from the plans per *b2T200aa1_update_112811.dgn* and also not shown in *alt5_update_112811.dgn* and *b2t200ca002.dgn* in the "hidden link," can you confirm the deletion of this wall.	Wall revisions are shown in the file "b2T200aa1_update_112811.dgn", and the color codes are as follow: Wall 1453 (purple) new, EB to1456+00 "A" line (red) delete Wall 1478 (purple) new (red) delete Wall 1441 (red) delete Wall 1452 (purple) shorten Per Section 13.4, the Design-Builder shall determine the location(s) and types of retaining walls needed on the Project.
76	3	RID	Conceptual-Plans, L-14 Section 11.3.1.1	Retaining Wall 1452: The latest layout for retaining wall 1452 may not accommodate 4:1 (H:V) embankments between I-805 and the northbound Mira Mesa off-ramp. Is the intent of the Department to construct embankments steeper than 4:1? Is a grading plan available for this area?	Department's approval is required for any embankments that are steeper than 4:1. Department anticipates that some embankments may require slopes steeper than the desired 4:1, but should be minimized. Per Section 13.4, the Design-Builder shall determine the location(s) and types of retaining walls needed on the Project. A grading plan is not available.
77	3	RID	Conceptual-Plans, L-17	At Station 1491+00, there is an existing retaining wall on the east side of the freeway. It appears that a standard 10' shoulder would require realigning a portion of this wall as well as extending it to the south. Is it the intent of this contract to modify the existing retaining wall in order to accommodate a 10' shoulder at this location?	The existing retaining wall may need to be revised and/or extended to accommodate a 10' shoulder in this area. Per Section 13.4, the Design-Builder shall determine the location(s) and types of retaining walls needed on the Project.

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
78	3	RID	Ongoing Contracts; Carroll Canyon North DAR	Will new bridge soffit lighting be required for the new Carroll Canyon Road Structure that is currently under construction. Since we are widening the structure, there may need to be new lighting	Yes, new soffit lighting will be required.
79	4	RID	Storm Water Data Report, Section 5 Biofiltration Swales/Strips	In the pdf titled "2010_01_29_805N Final SWDR PA&ED" under section 5 within the paragraph titled "Biofiltration Swales/Strips, Checklist T-1, Parts 1 & 2", there is a reference made to a "BMP Concept Plan" which according to the report presents the potential locations of BMP's along the project. The report goes on to reference an "Attachment A" which should contain supporting calculations. Both of these documents are not attached to the SWDR, and were not provided within the RID package provided on the Caltrans website. **Would the Department respectfully provide this information?**	The Attachment A named "2009_07_09_I805_SWDR_Final_Attachment_A.pdf" has been posted to the Data Room under "Additional_RID_12-01-11". It shows both the supporting calculations and the preliminary impacted Bioswales from the La Jolla Valley Drive project (EA 11-089754). They are identified with "LVD Realign" by the stations on both North Bound and South Bound of I-805. As for the BMP concept plan, showing the potential locations of the proposed treatment BMP (Bioswales), please refer to "Figures 3A, 3B, 3C & 3D - Project Features Maps" of the "I805N Final Environmental Document".
80	4	RID - "2010 01 29 805N Fnal SWDR PA&ED.pdf"	Article 2-last bullet and page 4	Please provide missing Attachment A referenced on the 4th pdf page of the Long Form – Storm Water Data Report. This document identifies BMPs to be constructed under EA 089754.	The Attachment A named "2009_07_09_I805_SWDR_Final_Attachment_A.pdf" has been posted to the Data Room under "Additional_RID_12-01-11". The preliminary impacted Bioswales from the La Jolla Valley Drive project (EA 11-089754) are identified with "LVD Realign" by the stations on both northbound and southbound of I-805. The 11-089751 Storm Water Data Report, dated July 2008 was issued as part of "Additional_RID_11-09-11"

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
81	4	Clarification No. 2	Item number 32	**Inconsistency Request – As noted in the response** "Wall limits for Stage 1 are shown in "b02T200aa1_update_112811.dgn" which has been posted to the hidden link. Design-Builder should construct wall from north end of bridge structure to approximately Sta 1456+00 "A" line". We could not locate this drawing "b02T200aa1_update_112811.dgn" as noted. Drawing "b2T200aa1_update_112811.dgn" has wall layouts that are X'd out. At this point, contrary to the Clarification response it looks like walls 1453, 1478 and 1441 have been deleted from our scope of work.	Wall revisions are shown in the file "b2T200aa1_update_112811.dgn", and the color codes are as follow: Wall 1453 (purple) new, EB to1456+00 "A" line (red) delete Wall 1478 (purple) new (red) delete Wall 1441 (red) delete Wall 1452 (purple) shorten Per Section 13.4, the Design-Builder shall determine the location(s) and types of retaining walls needed on the Project.
82	4	Clarification No. 2	Item number 32	Clarification No. 23 indicates the DAR will have two 4-foot inside shoulders. CAD file b2T200aa1_update_112811.dgn shows the total inside shoulder width between the DAR lanes as 8.0 feet, which does not leave any space for a concrete barrier. Also, no concrete barrier is shown in section A-A. Please confirm that a concrete barrier is not required between these DAR lanes.	A concrete barrier is required. Cross section A-A, stage 1 shows - ES to ES is 40 feet, 4-foot outside shoulders, 12-foot lanes and 8-foot median. It should be 4-foot outside shoulders, 11-foot lanes, 4-foot inside shoulders and 2-foot concrete median barrier.
83	4	Clarification No. 2	Item number 32	CAD file b2T200aa1_update_112811.dgn indicates retaining wall RW 1478 can be deleted. Without this wall a 1.5:1 cut slope would be required from approx Sta 1478+00 to Sta 1484+00 to keep the top of the slope within the state R/W. Please confirm that it would be acceptable to use a 1.5:1 slope as required to keep the grading limits within State R/W.	Any cut slope steeper than 2:1 will need Department's approval. Per Section 13.4, the Design-Builder shall determine the location(s) and types of retaining walls needed on the Project.

RFC No.	Category	Document	Section	Clarification	Response
84	4	Clarification No. 2	Item number 32	CAD file b2T200aa1_update_112811.dgn indicates retaining wall RW 1441 can be deleted. However, it appears that this retaining wall would be required from approx Sta 1443+00 to the beginning of the Carroll Canyon BOH widening on the northbound side in order to keep the fill slope from impacting the Mira Mesa Boulevard Off-Ramp and to support the bridge approach slab. Please confirm that only a portion of retaining wall 1441 should be deleted.	The final design will determine the length of the abutment wall and wing wall at this corner to keep the slope from impacting the Mira Mesa Blvd off-ramp. Per Section 13.4, the Design-Builder shall determine the location(s) and types of retaining walls needed on the Project.
85	4	Clarification No. 2	Item number 32	CAD file b2T200aa1_update_112811.dgn indicates retaining wall RW 1453 can be shortened. Shortening this retaining wall would result in a fill slope that would cover the ESA in this area. Please confirm that it would be OK to place a fill slope over this ESA.	Preliminary Design shows the wall ends at approximately station 1456+00 "A" line for Stage 1. Portions of this wall may be constructed in the future for the ultimate project. Per Section 13.4, the Design-Builder shall determine the location(s) and types of retaining walls needed on the Project. Fill in ESA area shall be avoided.
86	2	Clarifications and additional RID 2011-12-01	B2T200aa1_update_112811.dgn	The updated Phase 1 design file (provided 12-01-2011) indicates deletion of retaining walls 1441 and 1478 as shown in the concept plans. We assume that these walls should not be included in the final bid price. If walls are required as part of the final design, they will be negotiated as Additional Services. Is this assumption correct?	Walls have been deleted and revised. Per Section 13.4, the Design-Builder shall determine the location(s) and types of retaining walls needed on the Project. They will not be negotiated as "Additional Services."